
**QUANTIFYING THE RISK OF
GEOTECHNICAL
SITE INVESTIGATIONS**

JASON SCOTT GOLDSWORTHY

B.E. (Hons), M.I.E. (Aust)

Thesis submitted for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)



School of Civil and Environmental Engineering

JANUARY 2006

For my grandfather,
Kevin Marsh,
for his
dedication
and devotion

***"people know the price of everything
and the value of nothing"***

Oscar Wilde (1854-1900)

PREFACE

This thesis is the culmination of three and a half years work between July 2002 and January 2006. To the author's knowledge, all information and material obtained from other sources has been credited through citations and references. The following sections contain material for which the author claims originality.

In Chapter 3:

- Development and implementation of a method to investigate the risk and reliability of foundation designs based on the results from a site investigation.

In Chapter 4:

- Identification of a worst case scale of fluctuation (SOF) which is a function of the size of the averaging domain;
- Using a field translation technique to reduce aliasing or gridding when generating three-dimensional random fields based on a lognormal distribution; and
- Use of a depth constraint to reduce the contribution of small strains on settlement estimates.

In Chapter 5:

- Measurement of the conservatism inherent in settlement prediction techniques for the analysis and design of a foundation on a soil with a spatially random elastic modulus; and
- Identification of an influence region within which an averaged elastic modulus value yields settlement estimates that accommodate soil variability.

In Chapter 6:

- Measurement of the effect of site investigations on the selection of design parameters;
- Analysis of the effect of site investigations on foundation design.

In Chapter 7:

- Reliability analysis of foundation designs based on the results from a site investigation in comparison with an optimal foundation design achieved using the complete knowledge of the soil;
- Use of an average design error to measure degree of under- and over-design of a foundation design based on the results from a site investigation;
- Recommendation of a single sampling location in a foundation system consisting of multiple footings; and
- Evaluation of the effect of measurement errors on the design of a foundation.

In Chapter 8:

- Risk assessment of a foundation designed on the basis of results from a site investigation;
- Identification of an optimal site investigation expenditure that yields a foundation design with lowest financial risk;
- Evaluation of the benefits of increased site investigation expenditure or sampling on the financial risk of a design;
- Identification of the most cost-effective types of site investigation tests.

In Chapter 9:

- Evaluation of the optimal site investigation strategy at three soil sites, where sufficient soil data has been made available for accurate characterisation of the soil variability.

The following publications have resulted from the research contained within this thesis:

Goldsworthy, J S, Jaksa, M B, Kaggwa, G W S., Fenton, G A, Griffiths, D V and Poulos, H G (2005). "Reliability of Site Investigations Using Different Reduction Techniques for Foundation Design," *9th International Conference on Structural Safety and Reliability*, Rome, Italy, pp. 901–908. (On CD.)

Jaksa, M B, Goldsworthy, J S, Fenton, G A, Kaggwa, G W S, Griffiths, D V, Kuo, Y L and Poulos, H G (2005). "Towards Reliable and Effective Site Investigations," *Geotechnique*, 55(2), pp. 109-121.

Goldsworthy, J S, Jaksa, M B, Kaggwa, W S, Fenton, G A, Griffiths, D V and Poulos, H G (2004). "Cost of Foundation Failures Due to Limited Site Investigations," *The International Conference on Structural and Foundation Failures*, Singapore, pp. 398-409.

Goldsworthy, J S and Jaksa, M B (2004). "Effect of Design Models and Test Numbers on the Design of Pad Foundations," *6th Australian Young Geotechnical Professionals Conference*, Gold Cost, Australia, pp. 74-79.

Goldsworthy, J S, Jaksa, M B, Fenton, G A, Kaggwa, W S, Griffiths, D V, Poulos, H G and Kuo, Y L (2004). "Influence of Site Investigations on the Design of Pad Footings," *9th Australia New Zealand Conference on Geomechanics*, Auckland, New Zealand, pp. 282-288.

ABSTRACT

The site investigation phase plays a vital role in any foundation design where inadequate characterisation of the subsurface conditions may lead to either a significantly over designed foundation that is not cost-effective, or an under-designed foundation, which may result in foundation failure. As such, the scope of an investigation should be dependent on the conditions at the site and the importance of the structure. However, it is common for the expense dedicated to the site investigation to be a fraction of the total cost of the project, and is typically determined by budget and time constraints, and the experience and judgement of the geotechnical engineer. However, additional site investigation expenditure or sampling is expected to reduce the financial risk of the design by reducing the uncertainties in the geotechnical system and protecting against possible foundation failures.

This research has quantified the relative benefits of undertaking site investigations of increased and differing scope. This has been achieved by simulating the design process to yield a foundation design based on the results of a site investigation. Such a design has been compared to an optimal design that utilises the complete knowledge of the soil, which has only been possible due to the use of simulated soils. Comparisons between these two design types indicate the performance of the site investigation to accurately or adequately characterise the site conditions. Furthermore, the design based on the results of the site investigation have been analysed using the complete knowledge of the soil. This yields a probability of failure and, therefore, has been included in a risk analysis where the costs associated with the site investigation have been measured against the financial risk of the design. As such, potential savings in financial risk for increased site investigation expenditure have been subsequently identified.

A Monte Carlo analysis has been used in this research to incorporate the uncertainties in the foundation design process. Uncertainties have been included due to soil variability; sampling errors; measurement and transformation model errors; and errors related to the use of a simplified foundation response prediction method. The Monte Carlo analysis has

also provided the means to obtain results in a probabilistic framework to enable reliability and risk analyses. Computer code has been specifically developed with an aim to: generate a simulated soil that conforms to the variability of soil properties; simulate a site investigation to estimate data for a foundation design; simulate the design of a foundation and conduct a reliability and risk analysis of such a design.

Results indicate that there are significant benefits to be derived from increasing the scope of a site investigation in terms of the risk and reliability of the foundation design. However, it also appears that an optimal site investigation scope or expenditure exists where additional expenditure leads to a design with a higher financial risk due to the increased cost of the site investigation. The expected savings in terms of financial risk are significant when compared to the increased investigation cost. These results will assist geotechnical engineers in planning a site investigation in a more rational manner with knowledge of the associated risks.

STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university, or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying.

Signed:

Date: 30 January 2006

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This document encapsulates the last three and half years of research I have undertaken at the University of Adelaide, Australia. This period has been a special part of my life that I have thoroughly enjoyed and will always look back on with fond memories. This is direct result of the support, friendship and direction that several people have afforded me. First and foremost, I owe a great deal to my principal supervisor, Dr Mark Jaksa from the University of Adelaide. He has not only provided a great source of direction and support throughout this research, but has also become a close friend. For this I am forever indebted to him. I would also like to share my appreciation for the support of my co-supervisor, Dr William Kaggwa, also from the University of Adelaide. Although his involvement in this research has not been to the same extent as Dr Jaksa's, he has provided invaluable direction regarding the significance and application of results and the final structure of this document.

Acknowledgement is also made to the Australian Research Council who funded this research as part of Discovery Project Grant. Without their financial assistance, this research would not have been possible.

I would also like to acknowledge three additional people who have all been directly involved in this project: Professor Vaughan Griffiths, from the Colorado School of Mines, USA; Professor Harry Poulos, from Coffey Geosciences and the University of Sydney in Australia; and Professor Gordon Fenton, from Dalhousie University in Canada. Professor Poulos has given valuable direction regarding the foundation design process and the geotechnical engineering industry in general. Professor Griffiths graciously provided the three-dimensional finite element analysis code that has been used for the optimal design. Furthermore, he also provided invaluable direction regarding the prediction of footing settlements using finite element analyses. I would also specially like to thank Professor Fenton, who not only offered the use of his random field generator, which enabled the genera-

tion of a simulated soil, but also spent nearly 12 months at the University of Adelaide assisting with this research. Thus, his contribution and influence on this research should not be underestimated and I would like to offer my sincere gratitude for his time and assistance.

I have also been afforded some advice from Professor Fred Kulhawy, from Cornell University in USA, and Associate Professor Kok Kwang Phoon, from the National University of Singapore. Professor Kulhawy provided general direction in the early stages of this research, while Associate Professor Phoon has provided direction in the latter stages. For this I thank them both very much and appreciate their valuable time.

The wide range of results shown in this research has required the use of significant computing resources at the University of Adelaide. Therefore, it has been necessary to program, compile and build the computer code for execution on several different computing systems and two different platforms. I would like to thank four people in particular for the assistance they have given me in this capacity: Dr Stephen Carr, from the School of Civil and Environmental Engineering at the University of Adelaide, who has not only helped with the code generation, but also several other issues regarding software and computing; and Mr Paul Coddington, Patrick Fitzhenry and Grant Ward, who all provided assistance with building and running the computer code on a supercomputer managed by the South Australia Partnership for Advanced Computing (SAPAC) called Hydra. These people have gone beyond the call of duty to lend assistance regarding the intricacies of running computer code on a multi-processor system.

Finally, I would also like to thank my close friends and family who have supported me and helped me to enjoy this journey. I would especially like to thank my parents, Robyn and Tony Goldsworthy, who have always encouraged me to achieve my goals and afforded me unconditional support. I would also like to acknowledge my grandparents, Pat and Kevin Marsh, who have been an amazing source of support and encouragement, not only for these last few years. Last by no means least, I would like to thank my partner, Natalie Pearce, who has endured this journey with me, whilst always keeping a smile on her face. She is an amazing person who has ensured that I have kept on track and never lost sight of the final goal. For this I am eternally grateful.

Last of all, I would like to thank you, the reader, for spending the time in ploughing through this research, which I hold very dear. I hope you enjoy the read and find it enlightening in some way.

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>Abstract</i>	<i>v</i>
<i>Statement of Originality</i>	<i>vii</i>
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>Contents</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>xvii</i>
<i>List of Tables</i>	<i>xxxv</i>
<i>Notation</i>	<i>xxxix</i>
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
1.1 Site Investigations	1
1.2 Aim and Scope of this Research	3
1.3 Layout of this Thesis	4
Chapter 2 Literature Review	7
2.1 Introduction	7
2.2 Foundation Design	7
2.2.1 Site Characterisation	7
2.2.2 Shallow Foundations	13
2.2.3 Raft Foundations	25
2.2.4 Piled Foundations	26
2.2.5 Summary	26
2.3 Uncertainties in Geotechnical Engineering	27
2.3.1 Sources of Uncertainty for Soil Properties	27
2.3.2 Inherent Soil Variability	29
2.3.3 Statistical Uncertainty	39
2.3.4 Measurement Error	41
2.3.5 Transformation Model Uncertainty	43
2.4 Geotechnical Design Incorporating Uncertainties	45
2.5 Summary	54

Chapter 3	Methodology Development	55
3.1	Introduction	55
3.2	Method Overview	55
3.3	Soil Simulation	57
3.3.1	Target Distribution and Correlation Structure of Simulated Soil	57
3.3.2	Generating Random Fields	61
3.3.3	Transformation of the Generated Soil Properties	65
3.3.4	Effects of Local Averaging on Random Fields	66
3.3.5	Size of the Simulated Soil Site	67
3.4	Site Investigation	67
3.4.1	Patterns and Quantity of Sampling	68
3.4.2	Soil Parameter Reduction Techniques	71
3.4.3	Types of Soil Tests	73
3.5	Foundation Design Methodology	77
3.5.1	Pad Foundation Geometry	78
3.5.2	Requirement for an Alternative Foundation Type	79
3.6	Pad Foundation Design	79
3.6.1	Pad Foundation Design Criteria	80
3.6.2	Settlement Prediction Techniques	81
3.6.3	Determination of Rigid Footing Displacements	83
3.6.4	Procedure used to Account for Multiple Footing Interactions	85
3.6.5	Numerical Modelling of Footing Settlement	87
3.7	Monte Carlo Analysis	96
3.7.1	Nomenclature and Metrics	96
3.7.2	Number of Realisations	98
3.7.3	Optimisation of Computational Time	100
3.8	Summary	107
Chapter 4	Verification of Methodology	109
4.1	Introduction	109
4.2	Verifying the Properties in the Simulated Soil	109
4.2.1	Verifying the Target Distribution	109
4.2.2	Verifying the Correlation Structure	118
4.2.3	Investigation of Transformation Effects	122
4.3	Verification of the Implementation of Settlement Prediction Techniques	125
4.3.1	Comparing Simulation and Calculated Settlement Predictions	126
4.3.2	Calibration of 3DFEA to Measured Settlements	128
4.4	Verification of Mean and Variability of Settlement Estimates	135
4.5	Summary	142

Chapter 5	Effect of Different Settlement Prediction Techniques on the Design and Analysis of a Pad Foundation	143
5.1	Introduction	143
5.2	Settlement Analyses	145
5.2.1	Settlement Analysis on a Soil with Uniform Properties	145
5.2.2	Settlement Analysis on a Spatially Random Soil	151
5.2.3	Analysis Using an Influence Region of Properties	166
5.2.4	Summary	177
5.3	Pad Foundation Design Using Different Settlement Prediction Techniques	178
5.4	Summary	195
Chapter 6	Effect of Site Investigations on Design Parameters and the Design of a Pad Foundation	197
6.1	Introduction	197
6.2	Effect of Site Investigation Scope on Design Parameters	198
6.2.1	Soil Variability	198
6.2.2	Sampling Patterns and Reduction Techniques	202
6.2.3	Types of Soil Tests	211
6.2.4	Summary	213
6.3	Effect of Site Investigation Scope on the Expected Pad Foundation Design	213
6.3.1	Soil Variability	213
6.3.2	Sampling Patterns and Reduction Techniques	217
6.3.3	Types of Soil Tests	226
6.3.4	Settlement Prediction Techniques	234
6.3.5	Summary	236
6.4	Effect of Site Investigation Scope on the Variability of a Pad Foundation Design	236
6.4.1	Soil Variability	237
6.4.2	Sampling Patterns and Reduction Techniques	241
6.4.3	Types of Soil Tests	243
6.4.4	Settlement Prediction Techniques	246
6.5	Summary	249
Chapter 7	Reliability Assessment of a Site Investigation in Terms of Foundation Design	251
7.1	Introduction	251
7.2	Effect of Site Investigation Scope on the Probability of Under- and Over-Design	252
7.2.1	Soil Variability	252
7.2.2	Sampling Patterns and Reduction Techniques	260

7.2.3	Types of Soil Tests	265
7.2.4	Settlement Prediction Techniques	268
7.2.5	Summary	268
7.3	Effect of Site Investigation Scope on the Design Error	270
7.3.1	Soil Variability	271
7.3.2	Sampling Patterns and Reduction Techniques	276
7.3.3	Types of Soil Tests	280
7.3.4	Settlement Prediction Techniques	282
7.3.5	Analysis of a Single Pad Footing	284
7.3.6	Summary	285
7.4	Reliability Assessment Due to Individual Sources of Uncertainty	286
7.4.1	Statistical Uncertainty	286
7.4.2	Measurement Error	292
7.5	Summary	297
Chapter 8 Risk Assessment of Site Investigations in Terms of Foundation Design		299
8.1	Introduction	299
8.2	Calculation of Total Foundation Cost	300
8.2.1	Site Investigation and Construction Costs	300
8.2.2	Failure Costs	304
8.3	Effect of Site Investigation Scope on the Total Foundation Cost	308
8.3.1	Failure Analysis Using 3DFEA	309
8.3.2	Failure Analysis Using Schmertmann 2B-0.6	318
8.3.3	Variables Impacting the Effect of Site Investigation Scope on the Total Foundation Cost	320
8.3.4	Sensitivity of Rehabilitation Limits on the Total Foundation Cost	340
8.4	Optimal Site Investigation Strategies	341
8.5	Expected Savings from Increased Site Investigation	349
8.6	Summary	351
Chapter 9 Analysis Using Specific Soil Data		353
9.1	Introduction	353
9.2	Site 1: Stiff-Overconsolidated Clay	354
9.3	Site 2: Sand Site at the Texas A&M NGES	360
9.4	Site 3: Varved Clay	364
9.5	Summary	367
Chapter 10 Summary and Recommendations		369
10.1	Introduction	369

10.2 Summary	369
10.3 Limitations and Restrictions	379
10.3.1 Soil Simulation	379
10.3.2 Simulated Site Investigation	380
10.3.3 Foundation Design	381
10.4 Future Directions of Research	382
10.4.1 Analysis Using More Complex Soil Models	382
10.4.2 Incorporating the Bearing Capacity of a Foundation	383
10.4.3 Investigating the Design of Other Types of Foundation Systems	383
10.4.4 Analysing More Complex Site Investigation Strategies	384
10.4.5 Refining the Element Size	384
10.4.6 Other Recommended Research	385
10.5 Conclusion and Recommendations	386
References	387
Appendices	407
<hr/>	
Appendix A Settlement Analysis	409
Appendix B Average and Variance of Foundation Design Results	421
Appendix C Probabilities of Under- and Over-design and Probabilities of Obtaining an Optimal Design	437
Appendix D Average Design Error	459
Appendix E Foundation Design Costs	475

ADDENDUM

CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

No changes.

CHAPTER 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW

Page 17, Paragraph 1, add between Sentence 2 and 3:

Eq (2.5) is the common idealisation of the strain equation which, in actual fact, includes a radial strain component. However, for most foundation design applications, the strain estimate considers only the vertical component and, as such, will be adopted in this research.

Page 29, add after Paragraph 4:

The main reason for detrending data is to obtain a set of properties that are largely spatially independent (Fenton 199b). This is because classic statistical methods require independent and identically distributed data. The detrending process typically involves using regression analysis to fit a low-order polynomial (Jaksa et al. 1997) to the data set and removing it from the property value to leave a random residual, $w(z)$. However, Phoon et al. (2003) comments that detrending is not unique, and different procedures will result in different random residuals. As discussed earlier, Fenton (1999) warns that a trend should only be removed if it has physical meaning. Furthermore, Fenton (1999b) also warns that trends should be investigated with caution, because they could be a part of a larger process.

Phoon et al. (2003) suggests that the success of the detrending process can be measured by comparing the results of a statistical analysis on the random residual after a trend with an increasingly higher order polynomial is removed from the data. However, Fenton (1999) found that an apparent trend in a set of cone penetration test (CPT) data had little significance to the resulting statistical analysis. Therefore, Fenton (1999) did not remove

the trend which would have resulted in a different mean, variability and correlation structure.

Although past research has demonstrated that it is important to attain a statistically homogeneous data set for a meaningful statistical analysis, care must be taken when detrending data, because the apparent trend may be a part of a much larger process that is not captured in a finite sample data set.

Page 31, Paragraph 2, Sentence 1:

The correlation between two properties is bounded by -1 and 1, where $\rho_r = \pm 1$ relates to the observations being perfectly correlated (either positively or negatively) and $\rho_r = 0$ relates to the observations being completely unrelated or purely random, provided that the observations [X and Y in Equation (2.19)] are not functionally related (Vanmarcke 1977a).

CHAPTER 3 – METHODOLOGY DEVELOPMENT

Page 62, Paragraph 1, Sentence 1:

As LAS appears to generate random fields considerably faster than the Turning Bands Method, and does not suffer from a symmetric covariance structure (Fenton 2002), like the Fast Fourier Transformation, it is adopted for this research.

Page 65, Equation 3.3, replace with:

$$\sigma_{\ln x} = \sqrt{\ln \left(1 + \frac{\sigma_x^2}{\mu_x^2} \right)} \quad (3.3)$$

Page 66, Paragraph 1, add at end:

It should also be recognised that the SOF used throughout this research is the SOF of the underlying Gaussian random field, and not the SOF of the lognormal random field.

Page 73, Paragraph 3, add after Sentence 2:

It should also be recognised that the reduction techniques only average properties in the same horizontal plane. In other words, the reduction techniques do not combine elastic moduli at different depths.

Page 74, Paragraph 2, add at end:

Furthermore, the DMT can also be undertaken at smaller than 1.5 m depth intervals. However, it is rare that 30 DMT tests are taken in one borehole or sampling location, and the DMT is typically more discrete than the CPT. Therefore, for the purposes of this research, a vertical sampling rate of 1.5 m for the DMT is adopted.

Page 99, Paragraph 1, delete Sentence 1.**Page 99, Paragraph 2, Sentence 2:**

The analysis to investigate the convergence of the Monte Carlo analysis is based on a foundation system consisting of 9-pad footings, as shown in Figure 3-30, centred on a 50 m × 50 m site with a 30 m deep soil layer.

CHAPTER 4 – VERIFICATION OF METHODOLOGY**Page 110, Paragraph 4, add at end:**

However, it should also be recognised that the Chi-square goodness-of-fit test is based on independent samples, and as the SOF increases, the soil properties become more correlated and less independent. Therefore, the Chi-square test is less applicable when the SOF is large.

Page 136, Paragraph 3, Sentence 2:

Since the elastic modulus, E_i , is stochastic and represented by a lognormal random variable, the settlement can also be expressed in terms of a lognormal stochastic variable.

Page 137, Equation 4.11, replace with:

$$\text{Cov}[S_1, S_2] = \left(\frac{1 + \text{COV}_E^2}{\mu_E} \right)^2 \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n C_i^{1**} C_j^{2**} (1 + \text{COV}_E^2)^{\rho_{ij}} - \sum_{i=1}^n C_i^{1**} \sum_{j=1}^n C_j^{2**} \right] \quad (4.11)$$

CHAPTER 5 – EFFECT OF DIFFERENTIAL SETTLEMENT TECHNIQUES ON THE DESIGN AND ANALYSIS OF A PAD FOUNDATION

Page 158, add between Paragraphs 1 and 2:

The results shown in Figures 5-8 and 5-9 suggest that the variability of settlement estimates using 3DFEA is typically smaller than that from the other prediction models. This fact is evident because the distributions for 3DFEA settlement are narrower than the others. The 3DFEA settlement estimates are less variable because they make use of every soil property in the field, whereas the other prediction models only use a sample of elastic moduli to yield a settlement. Therefore, increased averaging occurs in 3DFEA settlement estimates, and therefore, the results are less variable. This explanation is also valid for comparisons between the other settlement prediction models. Comparisons between the variability are also influenced by the degree of conservatism in the model. It is shown later that more conservative prediction techniques, such as the Schmertmann Modified, yield more variable results. This is because the settlement estimates are closely linked to a lognormal distribution, and the variance and mean are related.

Page 162, add between Paragraphs 3 and 4:

Equation (5.7) assumes that the settlement estimates given by 3DFEA and the other techniques are independent. Therefore, the probabilities given in Table 5-3 also assume that the settlement estimates are independent. In actual fact, the settlement estimates will have some correlation because the same elastic moduli have been used in predicting the settlement. However, to keep this form of analysis relatively straightforward, the settlement estimates are assumed to be independent. The numerical analysis described later in this chapter, where footing settlement is determined as part of a Monte Carlo simulation incorporates the correlation between 3DFEA settlements and those from the other prediction techniques.

Page 188, add after Paragraph 3:

It should also be noted that the probabilities of under- and over-design, shown in Figures 5-30(a) and (b) respectively, do not add to unity for the same soil SOF and COV combination. This is because there is also a probability that the design based on 3DFEA and Schmertmann 2B-0.6 settlement prediction techniques will be equal. This is the case of the Schmertmann method yielding an optimal design, as is discussed later. It is also introduced, in later chapters, that the probability of obtaining an optimal design is

relatively high because of the discretisation in footing size to keep 3DFEA computational times manageable.

CHAPTER 6 – EFFECT OF SITE INVESTIGATIONS ON DESIGN PARAMETERS AND THE DESIGN OF A PAD FOUNDATION

Page 198, Paragraph 3, Sentence 2:

A sampling location includes all elastic moduli in a vertical sample, leading to 60 values spaced at 0.5 m intervals.

Page 198, Paragraph 3, add between Sentence 5 and 6:

In all cases, the target mean of the random field is set to be 10,000 kPa.

Page 204, Paragraph 2, Sentence 10, replace:

This is further discussed later in this section.

with

Although this may seem counterintuitive, the average design parameter is influenced by the variability of the sampled elastic modulus values. For example, in the limiting case when only a single elastic modulus is sampled, the variance in the sample is zero. However, when additional samples are taken, the variability increases and tends toward the target variance. The increase in average design parameter is further influenced by the lognormal distribution, where a higher variance results in an increasing mean. Therefore, the results in Figure 6-4, which show that the parameter variability increases as the sampling effort grows, also causes a larger average design parameter.

Page 209, Paragraph 1, add at end:

However, in this case, the ID and I2 methods yield identical results. Therefore, the ID result is not shown in Figures 6-8 and 6-9.

Page 219, add between Paragraphs 3 and 4:

The recommendation of an absolute number of sampling locations over a sampling rate may at first seem counterintuitive; however, the influence of property variability must be carefully considered. It seems from the results shown in Figures 6-15 and 6-16 that 5 sampling locations yields the best answer. This is most likely because adequate averaging between soil properties occurs with this number of sampling locations, and the property variability is, as a result, low. However, if the site size is reduced a sampling rate yields a recommendation for fewer sampling locations, which results in less property averaging.

Therefore, the property variability is high, and the error in the design is large. On the other hand, if the site is larger, a sampling rate infers a greater number of sampling locations, which may be redundant and has little influence on the accuracy of the design.

Hence, it follows that sampling methods that retain more information per sampling location achieve more accurate designs with fewer sampling locations. For example, the cone penetration test (CPT), which is a relatively continuous sampling method, requires fewer sampling locations to achieve an equally accurate design, than the standard penetration test (SPT). This type of analysis is discussed later, yet, in this research, the CPT is modelled to attain only 3 times as many samples as the SPT (§3.4.3). It should also be remembered that different test types are also influenced by their own inherent errors, as discussed earlier in Chapter 2 (§2.3.4), which have a considerable impact on the accuracy of the design. The influence of such inherent testing errors is also discussed later.

Although the results shown in Figures 6-15 and 6-16 suggest the use of an absolute number of sampling locations is preferred, it is important to remember that this analysis is based on a single-layered soil deposit that is statistically homogeneous. Additional sampling is always recommended for soil deposits with multiple layers and geological anomalies.

CHAPTER 7 – RELIABILITY ASSESSMENT OF A SITE INVESTIGATION IN TERMS OF FOUNDATION DESIGN

Page 290, Paragraph 1, add at end:

Figure 7-24 shows that the average design error is low when the soil SOF is small. This same phenomenon was shown in Figure 7-23(a) where the average design error was relatively small when a sample location was positioned around the site. The average design error is relatively low when the soil SOF is small because of two reasons. Firstly, the apparent variability of the soil properties is less when the soil SOF is small, as shown in Chapter 4 (§4.2.1). Secondly, and more importantly, considerable local averaging occurs when the soil SOF is small. Therefore, the variability of the sampled properties used in the footing design is less and, as a result, the average design error is low. In the limiting case, where the soil SOF approaches zero, soil properties at 0.5 m spacings will be the same because of local averaging. In this case, the average design error is zero.

CHAPTER 8 – RISK ASSESSMENT OF A SITE INVESTIGATION IN TERMS OF FOUNDATION DESIGN

Page 310, Paragraph 3, Sentence 2:

Figures 8-6 and 8-7, as well as other figures in Chapter 8, the terminology of “failure cost”, or “cost”, is used for the vertical axis label. These costs are, in fact, expected costs and reflect the average calculated over 1000 Monte Carlo realizations. Also note the different scales on the vertical axis for total and failure costs.

Page 347, Paragraph 4, Sentence 3:

Furthermore, it is also important to consider that this analysis considers only a single, statistically homogeneous layer of soil.

CHAPTER 9 – ANALYSIS USING SPECIFIC SOIL DATA

No changes.

CHAPTER 10 – SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

No changes.

REFERENCES

Fenton G A. (1999b). "Estimation for Stochastic Soil Models." *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*, 125(6), pp. 470-485.

Phoon K K, Quek S T and An P. (2003). "Identification of Statistically Homogeneous Soil Layers Using Modified Bartlett Statistics." *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*, 129(7), pp. 649-659.

LIST OF FIGURES

Chapter 1 Introduction

Chapter 2 Literature Review

Figure 2-1	Typical triaxial cell After Craig (Craig 1997)	9
Figure 2-2	Schematic of split spoon sampler in a standard penetration test After Bowles (1997)	9
Figure 2-3	Schematic of the cone penetrometer After Holtz and Kovacs (1981)	10
Figure 2-4	Schematic of the flat plate dilatometer After Marchetti (1980)	11
Figure 2-5	Herringbone sampling pattern After Ferguson (1992)	12
Figure 2-6	Four different sampling designs: (a) regular (square); (b) stratified random; (c) simple random and (d) stratified systematic unaligned After Ferguson (1992)	12
Figure 2-7	Schmertmann's strain influence triangles: (a) 2B-0.6 triangle from Schmertmann (1970) and (b) modified triangle from Schmertmann et al. (1978)	20
Figure 2-8	Result of the FEA of a clay slope After Griffiths and Fenton (2000)	22
Figure 2-9	Result of the FEA of the bearing capacity of a rigid strip footing After Griffiths et al. (2002a)	22
Figure 2-10	Effects of uncertainties on the estimate of a soil property After Kulhawy (1992)	28
Figure 2-11	Influence of measurement uncertainty and transformation model uncertainty After Phoon and Kulhawy (1999b)	44
Figure 2-12	(a) Normal and (b) log normal distributions After Baecher and Christian (2003)	50
Figure 2-13	Load, F , and capacity or resistance, R , distributions (normal) After Phoon et al. (1995)	51
Figure 2-14	(a) Probability density and (b) cumulative probability function of safety margin, M , based on normal F and R After Phoon et al. (1995)	51
Figure 2-15	Cost-benefit analysis After Phoon et al. (1995)	54

Chapter 3 Methodology Development

Figure 3-1	Simulation model flowchart	57
Figure 3-2	Elastic modulus values for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 2 m, (c) 4 m, (d) 8 m, (e) 16 m and (f) 32 m	58
Figure 3-3	LAS process illustrating a top-down approach After Fenton (1990)	62
Figure 3-4	Comparison of estimated and exact covariances across cell boundaries in Local Average Subdivision process After Fenton (1990)	63
Figure 3-5	Estimated covariance using LAS for 3-D isotropic field with scale of fluctuation (a) $\theta = 4$ (Averaged over 50 realisations) and (b) $\theta = 1/2$ (Averaged over 10 realisations) After Fenton (1990)	64
Figure 3-6	Relative size of site investigation area compared with total site area	68
Figure 3-7	Sampling patterns based on a regular grid (RG) pattern	69
Figure 3-8	Sampling patterns based on a stratified random (SR) pattern	69
Figure 3-9	Process of combining results from multiple samples into a reduced sample	71
Figure 3-10	Process of attributing test uncertainties	76
Figure 3-11	Comparison of test values with bias and random effects and actual soil properties	77
Figure 3-12	Process of increasing footing size	78
Figure 3-13	Threshold yielding an alternative foundation type (green – pad footing is suitable, red – requires an alternative foundation type)	79
Figure 3-14	Calculation of differential settlement between two adjacent footings	80
Figure 3-15	Janbu settlement equation coefficient μ_1 for varying soil depth to footing width ratio	82
Figure 3-16	Distribution of settlements for a (a) rigid and (b) flexible loaded areas After Holtz (1991)	83
Figure 3-17	Settlement of a flexible footing	84
Figure 3-18	Settlement of a rigid footing	84
Figure 3-19	Overlay of settlement distribution of a flexible and rigid footing	84
Figure 3-20	Centroid of the settlement distribution of a flexible footing	85
Figure 3-21	Two adjacent footings with areas A_1 and A_2 , and applied loads, P_1 and P_2	86
Figure 3-22	Determination of (a) internal and (b) external radius of annulus	86
Figure 3-23	Schematic of shaded annulus	86
Figure 3-24	Determination of angle, α	87
Figure 3-25	Effect of convergence tolerance on the (a) settlement estimate, (b) relative settlement error and (c) computational time using 3DFEA	90
Figure 3-26	Effect of increasing the number of elements beneath a footing on the accuracy of 3DFEA settlement estimates	92
Figure 3-27	Effect of the number of elements in the mesh (element size) on the accuracy and computational time of 3DFEA settlement estimates	94
Figure 3-28	Influence of boundary effects on the accuracy of 3DFEA settlement estimates	95

Figure 3-29	Notation of footing area or footing settlement	97
Figure 3-30	Pad foundation system used in analysis to determine suitable number of Monte Carlo realisations	99
Figure 3-31	Convergence rate of 9-pad system designed using 3DFEA and based on a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	100
Figure 3-32	Cross platform computational times	103
Figure 3-33	Typical steps in an MPI program	104
Figure 3-34	Effect of additional processors on the computational time and relative speed increase	106

Chapter 4 Verification of Methodology

Figure 4-1	Frequency distributions of elastic modulus values from the simulated soil using LAS (based on soil properties at the surface)	111
Figure 4-2	Effect of target soil COV on the sample (a) mean and (b) standard deviation	113
Figure 4-3	Effect of target soil SOF on the sample (a) mean and (b) standard deviation	114
Figure 4-4	Sample standard deviation of the elastic modulus field for an increasing (a) element size and (b) target SOF	115
Figure 4-5	Sample standard deviation of elastic modulus field based on different element sizes	116
Figure 4-6	Correlation structure of simulated field using <i>dlavx3</i> and a (a) COV of 50% and a SOF of 1 m and (b) COV of 50% and a SOF of 16 m	119
Figure 4-7	Correlation structure of simulated field using <i>dlspvx3</i> and a (a) COV of 50% and a SOF of 1 m and (b) COV of 50% and a SOF of 16 m	120
Figure 4-8	Surface properties for a soil COV of 50% and a SOF of 1 m using (a) <i>dlavx3</i> and (b) <i>dlspvx3</i> variance functions	121
Figure 4-9	Surface properties for a soil COV of 50% and a SOF of 16 m using (a) <i>dlavx3</i> and (b) <i>dlspvx3</i> variance functions	121
Figure 4-10	Correlation structures generated by <i>dlavx3</i> function for (a) increasing target SOF and (b) increasing target COV	122
Figure 4-11	Sample element (a) mean and (b) standard deviation of elastic modulus values at the surface ($z = 1$) from a simulated soil with a COV of 50% and a SOF of (i) 1 m, (ii) 4 m and (iii) 16 m	123
Figure 4-12	Sample element (a) mean and (b) standard deviation of elastic modulus values using <i>field translation</i> and a soil with a COV of 50% and a SOF of (i) 1 m, (ii) 4 m and (iii) 16 m	125
Figure 4-13	System of 9-pad footings	127
Figure 4-14	Comparison between group and individual settlement for each footing in the 9-pad foundation system	128
Figure 4-15	Comparison between measured settlement and 3DFEA settlement using a full depth analysis	130
Figure 4-16	Comparison between measured settlement and 3DFEA settlement using an analysis depth of (a) $2b$, (b) $5b$ and (c) $8b$, where b is the least plan dimension of the footing	131

Figure 4-17	Comparison between 3DFEA settlement with varying depth analyses and other settlement prediction techniques for 9 the pad footing foundation system with widths equal to (a) 1.5 m, (b) 2.5 m and (c) 3.5 m	133
Figure 4-18	Comparison between settlement estimates of 3DFEA with full and 5b depth with common settlement prediction techniques of a single pad footing of varying width under (a) constant load and (b) constant pressure	135
Figure 4-19	Distance used to determine correlation, ρ_{ij} , between two sample locations and between soil properties spaced in the vertical direction	137
Figure 4-20	Effect of increasing the sample separation distance on the average and standard deviation of settlement estimates using the adopted methodology and theoretical evaluation for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m and (b) 16 m	138
Figure 4-21	Effect of increasing the sample separation distance on the average and standard deviation of settlement estimates using the adopted methodology and theoretical evaluation for a soil SOF of 4 m and COV of (a) 50% and (b) 100%	139
Figure 4-22	Effect of increasing the sample separation distance on the average settlement error using the adopted methodology and theoretical solution on a soil with an increasing elastic modulus (a) SOF (COV of 50%) and (b) COV (SOF of 4 m)	141

Chapter 5 Effect of Different Settlement Prediction Techniques on the Design and Analysis of a Pad Foundation

Figure 5-1	Layout of (a) single, (b) 4-pad and (c) 9-pad system foundation system	144
Figure 5-2	Results of the settlement prediction techniques for a single pad footing for a soil with a uniform elastic modulus showing (a) absolute settlement and (b) relative to 3DFEA	146
Figure 5-3	Results of the settlement prediction techniques for each footing in the 4-pad system for a soil with a uniform elastic modulus showing (a) absolute settlement and (b) settlements relative to 3DFEA	149
Figure 5-4	Results for the corner, centre and remaining footings in the 9-pad system, for a soil with a uniform elastic modulus showing (a) absolute settlement and a (b) settlement error with 3DFEA	150
Figure 5-5	Settlement error relative to 3DFEA settlement for a single pad footing of varying size for a soil with a uniform elastic modulus	151
Figure 5-6	Frequency distribution of estimated settlement of a single pad footing, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	154
Figure 5-7	3DFEA settlement distribution with idealised lognormal distribution, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 4 m	155
Figure 5-8	Comparison of idealised settlement distributions, for a soil SOF of 4 m, with respect to the (a) 2:1, (b) Janbu, (c) Newmark, (d) Perloff, (e) Schmertmann Modified, (f) Schmertmann 2B-0.6, (g) Timoshenko and Goodier and (h) Westergaard settlement prediction techniques	156
Figure 5-9	Comparison of idealised settlement distributions, for a soil COV of 50%, with respect to the (a) 2:1, (b) Janbu, (c) Newmark, (d) Perloff, (e) Schmertmann Modified, (f) Schmertmann 2B-0.6, (g) Timoshenko and Goodier and (h) Westergaard settlement prediction techniques	157

Figure 5-10	Effect of increasing the soil COV (SOF of 8 m) on the average settlement of a single pad footing using (a) 3DFEA and (b) the Schmertmann 2B-0.6 technique	158
Figure 5-11	Effect of increasing the soil SOF (COV of 50%) on the average settlement of a single pad footing using (a) 3DFEA and (b) the Schmertmann 2B-0.6 technique	159
Figure 5-12	Effect of increasing the soil COV (SOF of 8 m) on the COV of settlement of a single pad footing using (a) 3DFEA and (b) Schmertmann's 2B-0.6 relationship	161
Figure 5-13	Effect of increasing the soil SOF (COV of 50%) on the COV of settlement of a single pad footing using (a) 3DFEA and (b) Schmertmann's 2B-0.6 relationship	161
Figure 5-14	Average settlement error for an increasing soil (a) COV (SOF of 8 m) and (b) SOF (COV of 50%)	164
Figure 5-15	Pressure isobars shown for a square and strip footing After Bowles (1997)	167
Figure 5-16	Example of a site investigation programme consisting of 10 random borehole locations for a foundation system with 4 pad footings and their corresponding optimal influence region areas	168
Figure 5-17	Increasing influence areas from a (a) vertical line to a (d) comparatively large region	169
Figure 5-18	Effect of increasing the size of the influence region within which properties are averaged using (a) SA, (b) GA and (c) HA on the average settlement error of a single pad footing, for an increasing soil COV and SOF of 8 m	170
Figure 5-19	Effect of increasing the size of the influence region within which properties are averaged using (a) SA, (b) GA and (c) HA on the average settlement error of a single pad footing, for an increasing soil SOF and COV of 50%	171
Figure 5-20	Effect of increasing the influence region within which soil properties are averaged with the (a) SA and (b) GA on the average settlement error of a single pad footing of varying widths, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	175
Figure 5-21	Effect of increasing the influence region within which soil properties are averaged using the (a) SA and (b) GA on the average settlement error of a single pad footing using different prediction relationships, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	176
Figure 5-22	Effect of increasing the influence region within which soil properties are averaged using the (a) SA and (b) GA on the average settlement error of a single pad footing using different prediction relationships, for a soil COV of 100% and SOF of 8 mm	177
Figure 5-23	Difference between design area distributions using the Schmertmann 2B-0.6 prediction technique with a (i) 0.5 m and (ii) 0.05 m discretisation for a single pad footing, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 16 m	179
Figure 5-24	Effect of increasing soil COV and SOF on the average total footing area of a system of 9-pad footings, designed using (a) 3DFEA and (b) the Schmertmann 2B-0.6 prediction technique	181
Figure 5-25	Effect of increasing soil COV and SOF on the COV total footing area of a system of 9-pad footings, designed using (a) 3DFEA and (b) the Schmertmann 2B-0.6 prediction technique	181

Figure 5-26	Footing number convention for the 9-pad system shown in 5-1(c)	183
Figure 5-27	Footing area (a) average and (b) COV for individual footings in the 9-pad system designed using 3DFEA and the Schmertmann's 2B-0.6 technique, for a COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	185
Figure 5-28	Effect of increasing the horizontal to vertical SOF ratio (COV of 50%) on the (a) average and (b) COV total footing area, of the 9-pad system, designed using 3DFEA and Schmertmann 2B-0.6 technique	186
Figure 5-29	Effect of increasing the horizontal to vertical SOF ratio (COV of 50%) on the average total footing area, of the 9-pad system, designed using 3DFEA and Schmertmann 2B-0.6 technique	187
Figure 5-30	Effect of increasing soil COV and SOF on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design of a 9-pad system designed using the Schmertmann 2B-0.6 technique (SCH)	188
Figure 5-31	Effect of increasing soil (a) COV (SOF of 8 m) and (b) SOF (COV of 50%) on the probability of under-design of a 9-pad system, designed using each settlement prediction technique	189
Figure 5-32	Effect of increasing soil (a) COV (SOF of 8 m) and (b) SOF (COV of 50%) on the probability of over-design of a 9-pad system, designed using each settlement prediction technique	190
Figure 5-33	Effect of increasing soil COV and SOF on the average design error of a 9-pad system designed using the Schmertmann 2B-0.6 prediction technique	193
Figure 5-34	Effect of increasing soil (a) COV (SOF of 8 m) and (b) SOF (COV of 50%) on the average design error of a 9-pad system, designed using each settlement prediction technique	193

Chapter 6 Effect of Site Investigations on Design Parameters and the Design of a Pad Foundation

Figure 6-1	Effect of increasing the soil (a) COV and (b) SOF on the sampled data and soil average	199
Figure 6-2	Effect of increasing the target soil (a) COV and (b) SOF on the sample data and soil standard deviation	201
Figure 6-3	Sampling locations based on the regular grid pattern Repeated from 3-7	202
Figure 6-4	Histogram of elastic modulus values resulting from a site investigation program consisting of sample locations arranged in a regular grid pattern for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	203
Figure 6-5	Effect of using different reduction techniques on the estimate of soil properties based on a site investigation program consisting of sample locations arranged in a regular grid pattern for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	206
Figure 6-6	Sample distributions of the (a) non-reduced sampled data and the reduced sample using the (b) SA, (c) GA, (d) HA, (e) MN and (f) 1Q from 5 sample locations, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	208
Figure 6-7	Sample distributions of the (a) non-reduced sampled data and the reduced sample using the (b) SA, (c) GA, (d) HA, (e) MN and (f) 1Q from 25 sample locations, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	208
Figure 6-8	Effect of increased sampling using different reduction techniques on the reduced sample average for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	209

Figure 6-9	Effect of increased sampling using different reduction techniques on the reduced sample standard deviation for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	209
Figure 6-10	Effect of including uncertainties on the design parameter (a) average and (b) standard deviation based on 1, 5 and 25 CPT samples, arranged in a RG for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	212
Figure 6-11	Standard legend of results for Chapter 6, Chapter 7, Chapter 8 and Chapter 9	214
Figure 6-12	Sampling arrangements with the same number of sampling locations for the (a) RG and (b) SR	215
Figure 6-13	Effect of sampling on the mean total footing area, for an increasing soil (a) COV (SOF of 8 m) and (b) SOF (COV of 50%)	215
Figure 6-14	Effect of increasing the degree of anisotropy for a horizontal soil SOF, θ_h , of (a) 8 m, (b) 16 m and (c) 32 m on the average total footing area based on a site investigation	218
Figure 6-15	Effect of increased sampling on a site investigation of varying size, where samples are arranged in a (a) RG, (b) SR and (c) RN pattern and reduced using the SA for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	220
Figure 6-16	Effect of sampling rate per 300 m ² on a site investigation of varying size, where samples are arranged in a (a) RG, (b) SR and (c) RN pattern and reduced using the SA for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	220
Figure 6-17	Effect of increased sampling with different sampling patterns on the average total footing area, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	221
Figure 6-18	Effect of sampling with different reduction techniques on the average total footing area, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m, (a) including MN and (b) excluding MN	223
Figure 6-19	Effect of sampling with different reduction techniques on the average total footing area based on a (a) SR and (b) RN sampling pattern for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	225
Figure 6-20	Effect of sampling on the average footing area of each footing in the 9-pad system for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	227
Figure 6-21	Effect of sampling using different test types on the average total footing area of the 9-pad system for a soil SOF of 8 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	229
Figure 6-22	Effect of sampling using different test types on the average total footing area of the 9-pad system for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 8 m and (c) 32 m	229
Figure 6-23	Effect of sampling, including measurement and transformation model errors for the (a) SPT and (b) CPT on the average total footing area, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 4 m	231
Figure 6-24	Effect of sampling and the use of different settlement relationships on the average total footing area of the 9-pad system for a soil SOF of 8 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	235
Figure 6-25	Effect of sampling and the use of different settlement relationships on the average total footing area of the 9-pad system for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 8 m and (c) 32 m	235
Figure 6-26	Sample distributions of total footing area for the Schmertmann 2B-0.6 settlement relationship for a soil SOF of 8 m and COV of (a) 50% and (b) 100%	238

Figure 6-27	Effect of sampling on the COV of total footing area, for an increasing soil (a) COV (SOF of 8 m) and (b) SOF (COV of 50%)	239
Figure 6-28	Effect of sampling on the spread of total footing area using ± 1 standard deviation from the average using Schmertmann 2B-0.6 and 3DFEA for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	241
Figure 6-29	Effect of increased sampling with different sampling patterns on the COV of total footing area, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	242
Figure 6-30	Effect of sampling with different reduction techniques on the standard deviation of total footing area, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	243
Figure 6-31	Effect of sampling with different reduction techniques on the COV of total footing area, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	243
Figure 6-32	Effect of sampling with different test types on the COV of total footing area of the 9-pad system, for a soil SOF of 8 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	245
Figure 6-33	Effect of sampling with different test types on the COV of total footing area of the 9-pad system, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 8 m and (c) 32 m	245
Figure 6-34	Effect of sampling and settlement technique on the COV total footing area of the 9-pad system, for a soil SOF of 8 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	247
Figure 6-35	Effect of sampling and settlement technique on the COV total footing area of the 9-pad system, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 8 m and (c) 32 m	247

Chapter 7 Reliability Assessment of a Site Investigation in Terms of Foundation Design

Figure 7-1	Effect of sampling on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design, for an increasing soil COV (SOF of 8 m)	253
Figure 7-2	Effect of sampling on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design, for an increasing soil SOF (COV of 50%)	254
Figure 7-3	Effect of sampling on the probability of obtaining the optimal design, for an increasing soil (a) COV (SOF of 8 m) and (b) SOF (COV of 50%)	257
Figure 7-4	Effect of sampling on the probability of under- and over-design, and probability of obtaining an optimal design, for each footing in the 9-pad system, based on a SI (RG, SA, CPT)	258
Figure 7-5	Effect of sampling on the probability of a requiring an alternative design for the 9-pad system for an increasing soil COV and SOF of 8 m	260
Figure 7-6	Effect of sampling with different sampling patterns on the probability of under- and over-design and the probability of obtaining an optimal, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	261
Figure 7-7	Effect of increased sampling with different reduction techniques on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	263
Figure 7-8	Effect of sampling with different test types on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal design, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	266

Figure 7-9	Effect of sampling and the use of different settlement prediction techniques on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	269
Figure 7-10	Effect of increased sampling on the average design error, for an increasing soil COV and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m, (c) 8 m and (d) 32 m	272
Figure 7-11	Effect of increased sampling on the average design error, for an increasing soil SOF and COV of (a) 10%, (b) 20%, (c) 50% and (d) 100%	273
Figure 7-12	Effect of increased sampling on the average design error, for an increasing soil (a) COV (SOF of 8 m) and (b) SOF (COV of 50%)	274
Figure 7-13	Effect of increased sampling on the average total footing area, for an increasing soil SOF and COV of 50%	275
Figure 7-14	Effect of sampling on the average design error of each footing in the 9-pad system, based on a design using Sch2B and a SI (CPT, RG, SA) and an optimal design using 3DFEA and CK, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	277
Figure 7-15	Effect of sampling using different patterns on the average design error, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	278
Figure 7-16	Effect of sampling and different reduction techniques on the average design error, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	279
Figure 7-17	Effect of sampling and different test types using the (a) SA, (b) GA and (c) 1Q reduction techniques on average design error, for a soil COV of 50 % and SOF of 8 m	281
Figure 7-18	Effect of sampling and different settlement prediction techniques for the design based on a SI (CPT, RG, SA) on the average design error of the 9-pad system, for a soil SOF of 8 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	283
Figure 7-19	Effect of sampling and different settlement prediction techniques for the design based on a SI (CPT, RG, SA) on the average design error of the 9-pad system, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 8 m and (c) 32 m	283
Figure 7-20	Effect of sampling on the average design error of a single pad footing, for an increasing soil (a) COV (SOF of 4 m) and (b) SOF (COV of 50%)	285
Figure 7-21	Sampling locations in the site area with respect to the system of 9-pad footings	287
Figure 7-22	Average design error of a single pad footing at sample locations, for a soil SOF of 4 m and COV of (a) 20% and (b) 100% (Note the change in scale of E[DE])	288
Figure 7-23	Average design error of a single pad footing at sample locations, for a soil COV of 50 % and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m, (c) 16 m and (d) 100 m	289
Figure 7-24	Effect of increasing the sample-to-footing separation distance on the average design error of a single pad footing, for an increasing soil SOF and COV of 50%	290
Figure 7-25	Average design error of a 4-pad system at sample locations for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m and (c) 16 m	291
Figure 7-26	Average design error of a 9-pad system at sample locations, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m and (c) 16 m	291

Figure 7-27	Effect of increasing the bias and random components of measurement error for the (a) SPT and (b) CPT, on the average design error, for a soil with a uniform elastic modulus	293
Figure 7-28	Effect of increasing the bias and random components of measurement error for the SPT, on the average design error, for a soil with a SOF of 4 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	294
Figure 7-29	Effect of increasing the bias and random components of measurement error for the SPT, on the average design error, for a soil with a COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 16 m	294
Figure 7-30	Effect of increasing the bias and random components of measurement error for the CPT, on the average design error, for a soil with a SOF of 4 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	294
Figure 7-31	Effect of increasing the bias and random components of measurement error for the CPT, on the average design error, for a soil with a COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 16 m	294
Figure 7-32	Effect of increasing the bias and random components of measurement error, based on a TT with a vertical sampling rate of (a) 1, (b) 2, (c) 4 and (d) 8 samples per borehole, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 4 m	296

Chapter 8 Risk Assessment of Site Investigations in Terms of Foundation Design

Figure 8-1	Relationship between construction cost (excluding substructure) and number of storeys	301
Figure 8-2	Relationship of minor and major retrofit and demolish and rebuild for buildings of varying storeys	305
Figure 8-3	Criteria of damage based on angular distortion After Bjerrum (1963)	306
Figure 8-4	Rehabilitation cost ratio for buildings of varying numbers of storeys undergoing increasing (a) total and (b) differential settlement	308
Figure 8-5	Schematic of the 5-storey building with 9 columns transferring loads to the foundations	309
Figure 8-6	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the construction, failure and total cost based on 3DFEA, for a soil SOF of 8 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	311
Figure 8-7	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the construction, failure and total cost based on 3DFEA, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 32 m	312
Figure 8-8	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the construction cost of the design	313
Figure 8-9	Sample distributions of construction, failure and total costs for foundation designs based on (a) 1, (b) 5 and (c) 25 sample locations, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	314
Figure 8-10	Sample distribution of maximum settlements of the foundation design analysed using complete knowledge, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 16 m	315
Figure 8-11	Effect of increased sampling on the number of occurrences of ‘true’ (a) total and (b) differential settlements, based on 3DFEA using CK, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 16 m	317

Figure 8-12	Effect of increasing the width of the plan area of the influence region on the mean settlement error of a single footing for different site conditions and footing widths, b .	319
Figure 8-13	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the construction, failure and total cost, based on an influence region analysis, for a soil SOF of 8 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	321
Figure 8-14	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the construction, failure and total cost, based on an influence region analysis, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 32 m	322
Figure 8-15	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the total cost, based on an influence region analysis, for an increasing soil (a) COV (SOF of 8 m) and (b) SOF (COV of 50%)	325
Figure 8-16	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the construction cost including and excluding site investigation costs, for an increasing soil COV and SOF of 8 m	326
Figure 8-17	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure with different reduction techniques on the total cost, based on an influence region analysis, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	327
Figure 8-18	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure with different reduction techniques on the construction cost, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	328
Figure 8-19	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure with different test types on the total cost of the foundation, based on an influence region analysis, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	329
Figure 8-20	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure with different settlement techniques on the total cost of the foundation, based on an influence region analysis, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF 8 m	331
Figure 8-21	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure with different settlement techniques on the total cost of the foundation, based on an influence region analysis, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF 8 m	331
Figure 8-22	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure using the (a) SA, (b) GA and (c) 1Q on the total cost of 3 different building sizes for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	333
Figure 8-23	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the construction and failure costs of 3 different building sizes, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	335
Figure 8-24	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the 25-pad system showing (a) total costs for different reduction techniques and (b) all costs using only the 1Q, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	337
Figure 8-25	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the (a) total cost, (b) construction cost and (c) failure cost, for an increasing soil mean elastic modulus, a COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	339
Figure 8-26	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the probability of requiring an alternative foundation type, for a soil with an increasing mean elastic modulus, a COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	340
Figure 8-27	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure using the 1Q and the CPT, on the total cost, based on different rehabilitation limits, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	342

Figure 8-28	Effect of increased site investigation using the 1Q on the total cost, based on an influence region analysis, for an increasing soil (a) COV (SOF of 8 m) and (b) SOF (COV of 50%)	344
Figure 8-29	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the total cost for changing soil variability	345
Figure 8-30	Cost of the optimal site investigation for different reduction techniques and test types, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	345
Figure 8-31	Total costs results from the optimal site investigation for different reduction techniques and test types, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	346
Figure 8-32	Total cost savings for an increased site investigation cost using different test types, for a soil SOF of 8 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	350

Chapter 9 Analysis Using Specific Soil Data

Figure 9-1	Schematic of the 3-storey building with 9 columns transferring loads to the foundations	354
Figure 9-2	Field testing layout for the Site 1 After Jaksa (1995)	355
Figure 9-3	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the total cost, using different reduction techniques, for Site 1	356
Figure 9-4	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the total cost, using different settlement prediction techniques, for Site 1	357
Figure 9-5	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the probability of requiring an alternative foundation design, using different settlement prediction techniques, for Site 1	359
Figure 9-6	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the construction cost, using different settlement prediction techniques, for Site 1	359
Figure 9-7	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the total cost, using different reduction techniques, for Site 2	362
Figure 9-8	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the probability of requiring an alternative foundation design, using different reduction techniques, for Site 2	362
Figure 9-9	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the total cost, using different settlement prediction techniques, for Site 2	363
Figure 9-10	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the probability of requiring an alternative foundation design, using different settlement prediction techniques, for Site 2	363
Figure 9-11	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the total cost, using different (a) reduction techniques and (b) test types, for Site 3	365
Figure 9-12	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the total cost, using different settlement prediction techniques, for Site 3	366
Figure 9-13	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the probability of requiring an alternative foundation design, using different settlement prediction techniques, for Site 3	367
Figure 9-14	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure on the construction cost, using different settlement prediction relationships, for Site 3	368

Chapter 10 Summary and Recommendations

Figure 10-1	Using an influence region to determine which soil properties should be considered	372
Figure 10-2	General relationship between increased site investigation expenditure and total cost for different soil conditions	377

Appendices

Appendix A Settlement Analysis

Figure A-1	Settlement distributions of different settlement prediction techniques for a soil with a COV of 10% and SOF of 8 m	410
Figure A-2	Settlement distributions of different settlement prediction techniques for a soil with a COV of 20% and SOF of 8 m	411
Figure A-3	Settlement distributions of different settlement prediction techniques for a soil with a COV of 100% and SOF of 8 m	412
Figure A-4	Settlement distributions of different settlement prediction techniques for a soil with a COV of 50% and SOF of 1 m	413
Figure A-5	Settlement distributions of different settlement prediction techniques for a soil with a COV of 50% and SOF of 4 m	414
Figure A-6	Settlement distributions of different settlement prediction techniques for a soil with a COV of 50% and SOF of 16 m	415
Figure A-7	Effect of increasing the soil COV (SOF of 8 m) on the average settlement of a single pad footing using different prediction techniques	416
Figure A-8	Effect of increasing the soil COV (SOF of 8 m) on the settlement COV of a single pad footing using different prediction techniques	417
Figure A-9	Effect of increasing the soil SOF (COV of 50%) on the average settlement of a single pad footing using different prediction techniques	418
Figure A-10	Effect of increasing the soil SOF (COV of 50%) on the settlement COV of a single pad footing using different prediction techniques	419

Appendix B Average and Variance of Foundation Design Results

Figure B-1	Effect of increasing the horizontal to vertical SOF ratio (COV of 50%) on the average total footing area, of the 9-pad system, designed using 3DFEA and different prediction techniques	422
Figure B-2	Effect of increasing the horizontal to vertical SOF ratio (COV of 50%) on the COV of total footing area, of the 9-pad system, designed using 3DFEA and different prediction techniques	423
Figure B-3	Effect of increased sampling using different reduction techniques on the average total footing area, for a soil SOF of 8 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	424
Figure B-4	Effect of increased sampling using different reduction techniques on the average total footing area, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 32 m	425
Figure B-5	Effect of increased sampling and the inclusion of measurement and transformation model errors of the SPT on the average total footing area, for a soil SOF of 8 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	426

Figure B-6	Effect of increased sampling and the inclusion of measurement and transformation model errors of the SPT on the average total footing area, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 16 m	427
Figure B-7	Effect of increased sampling and the inclusion of measurement and transformation model errors of the CPT on the average total footing area, for a soil SOF of 8 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	428
Figure B-8	Effect of increased sampling and the inclusion of measurement and transformation model errors of the CPT on the average total footing area, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 16 m	429
Figure B-9	Effect of increased sampling and the inclusion of measurement and transformation model errors of the TT on the average total footing area, for a soil SOF of 8 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	430
Figure B-10	Effect of increased sampling and the inclusion of measurement and transformation model errors of the TT on the average total footing area, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 16 m	431
Figure B-11	Effect of increased sampling and the inclusion of measurement and transformation model errors of the DMT on the average total footing area, for a soil SOF of 8 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	432
Figure B-12	Effect of increased sampling and the inclusion of measurement and transformation model errors of the DMT on the average total footing area, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 16 m	433
Figure B-13	Effect of increased sampling using different reduction techniques on the COV of total footing area, for a soil SOF of 8 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	434
Figure B-14	Effect of increased sampling using different reduction techniques on the COV of total footing area, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 32 m	435
 Appendix C Probabilities of Under- and Over-design and Probabilities of Obtaining an Optimal Design		
Figure C-1	Effect of increased sampling on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal design, for a soil SOF of 1 m and varying COV	438
Figure C-2	Effect of increased sampling on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal design, for a soil SOF of 4 m and varying COV	439
Figure C-3	Effect of increased sampling on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal design, for a soil SOF of 32 m and varying COV	440
Figure C-4	Effect of increased sampling on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal design, for a soil COV of 10% and varying SOF	441
Figure C-5	Effect of increased sampling on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal design, for a soil COV of 20% and varying SOF	442
Figure C-6	Effect of increased sampling on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal design, for a soil COV of 100% and varying SOF	443

Figure C-7	Effect of increased sampling with different reduction techniques on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal design, for a soil COV of 20% and SOF of 8 m	444
Figure C-8	Effect of increased sampling with different reduction techniques on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal design, for a soil COV of 100% and SOF of 8 m	445
Figure C-9	Effect of increased sampling with different reduction techniques on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal design, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 1 m	446
Figure C-10	Effect of increased sampling with different reduction techniques on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal design, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 4 m	447
Figure C-11	Effect of increased sampling with different reduction techniques on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal design, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 32 m	448
Figure C-12	Effect of increased sampling with different test types on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal design, for a soil COV of 20% and SOF of 8 m	449
Figure C-13	Effect of increased sampling with different test types on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal design, for a soil COV of 100% and SOF of 8 m	450
Figure C-14	Effect of increased sampling with different test types on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal design, for a soil with a COV of 50% and a SOF of 1 m	451
Figure C-15	Effect of increased sampling with different test types on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal design, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 4 m	452
Figure C-16	Effect of increased sampling with different test types on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal design, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 32 m	453
Figure C-17	Effect of increased sampling and different prediction techniques on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal design, for a soil COV of 20% and SOF of 8 m	454
Figure C-18	Effect of increased sampling and different prediction techniques on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal design, for a soil COV of 100% and SOF of 8 m	455
Figure C-19	Effect of increased sampling and different prediction techniques on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal design, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 1 m	456
Figure C-20	Effect of increased sampling and different prediction techniques on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal design, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 4 m	457
Figure C-21	Effect of increased sampling and different prediction techniques on the probability of (a) under- and (b) over-design and (c) the probability of obtaining an optimal design, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 32 m	458

Appendix D Average Design Error

Figure D-1	Effect of increased sampling on the average design error for a soil with an increasing COV and a SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 32 m	460
------------	---	-----

Figure D-2	Effect of increased sampling on the average design error for a soil with an increasing SOF and a COV of (a) 10%, (b) 20% and (c) 100%	461
Figure D-3	Effect of increased sampling with different reduction techniques on the average design error for a soil SOF of 8 m and a COV of (a) 10%, (b) 20% and (c) 100%	462
Figure D-4	Effect of increased sampling with different reduction techniques on the average design error for a soil with a COV of 50% and a SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 32 m	463
Figure D-5	Effect of increased sampling with different test types and the SA on the average design error for a soil with a SOF of 8 m and a COV of (a) 10%, (b) 20% and (c) 100%	464
Figure D-6	Effect of increased sampling with different test types and the SA on the average design error for a soil with a COV of 50% and a COV of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 32 m	465
Figure D-7	Effect of increased sampling with different test types and the GA on the average design error for a soil with a SOF of 8 m and a COV of (a) 10%, (b) 20% and (c) 100%	466
Figure D-8	Effect of increased sampling with different test types and the GA on the average design error for a soil with a COV of 50% and a COV of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 32 m	467
Figure D-9	Effect of increased sampling with different test types and the 1Q on the average design error for a soil with a SOF of 8 m and a COV of (a) 10%, (b) 20% and (c) 100%	468
Figure D-10	Effect of increased sampling with different test types and the 1Q on the average design error for a soil with a COV of 50% and a COV of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 32 m	469
Figure D-11	Effect of increased sampling using the GA and different settlement prediction techniques on the average design error, for a soil SOF of 8 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	470
Figure D-12	Effect of increased sampling using the GA and different settlement prediction techniques on the average design error, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 32 m	471
Figure D-13	Effect of increased sampling with different reduction techniques on the average design error of the single pad foundation system, for a soil SOF of 4 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	472
Figure D-14	Effect of increased sampling with different reduction techniques on the average design error of the single pad foundation system, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 16 m	473

Appendix E Foundation Design Costs

Figure E-1	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure with different reduction techniques on the total cost, based on an influence region analysis, for a soil SOF of 8 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	476
Figure E-2	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure with different reduction techniques on the total cost, based on an influence region analysis, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 32 m	477
Figure E-3	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure with different reduction techniques on the construction cost, for a soil SOF of 8 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	478

Figure E-4	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure with different reduction techniques on the construction cost, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 32 m	479
Figure E-5	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure with different test types on the total cost, based on an influence region analysis, for a soil SOF of 8 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	480
Figure E-6	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure with different test types on the total cost, based on an influence region analysis, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 32 m	481
Figure E-7	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure with different test types on the construction cost, for a soil SOF of 8 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	482
Figure E-8	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure with different test types on the construction cost, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 32 m	483
Figure E-9	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure with different settlement prediction techniques on the total cost, based on an influence region analysis, for a soil SOF of 8 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	484
Figure E-10	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure with different settlement prediction techniques on the total cost, based on an influence region analysis, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 32 m	485
Figure E-11	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure with different settlement prediction techniques on the construction cost, for a soil SOF of 8 m and COV of (a) 20%, (b) 50% and (c) 100%	486
Figure E-12	Effect of increased site investigation expenditure with different settlement prediction techniques on the construction cost, for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of (a) 1 m, (b) 4 m and (c) 32 m	487

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1 Introduction

Chapter 2 Literature Review

Table 2-1	Recommendations for varying site investigation plans After Ferguson (1992)	12
Table 2-2	Suggested uses for bearing capacity equations After Bowles (1997)	15
Table 2-3	Relative importance of immediate, consolidation and secondary settlement for different soil types After Holtz (1991)	16
Table 2-4	Tolerable settlement of buildings in millimetres Recommended maximum values in parenthesis After Bowles (1997)	24
Table 2-5	Summary of Allowable Settlements for Different Buildings and Limiting Criteria After Sowers (1962)	24
Table 2-6	Inherent soil variability based on common test types After Phoon et al. (1995)	32
Table 2-7	Example scale of fluctuation values based of geotechnical properties After Phoon et al. (1995)	33
Table 2-8	Statistical properties from extensively tested sites	35
Table 2-9	Measurement errors of common in situ tests expressed as a coefficient of variation After Phoon and Kulhawy (1999a)	42
Table 2-10	Correlations between soil properties and test results for (a) cohesive and (b) non-cohesive soils After Phoon and Kulhawy (1999b)	46
Table 2-11	Design capacity example using several assumptions and equations After Kulhawy (1984)	47

Chapter 3 Methodology Development

Table 3-1	Range of statistical properties used in soil simulation	59
Table 3-2	Sampling density based on 1 sample/300 m ² compared with adopted sampling density for research methodology	70
Table 3-3	Vertical sampling frequencies for each test type (element size = 0.5 m × 0.5 m × 0.5 m)	74
Table 3-4	Uncertainties due to measurement and transformation model error for each test type	75

Table 3-5	Comparison of settlement prediction techniques adopted in the methodology, not including the numerical method	81
Table 3-6	Element and site sizes used to increase the number of elements beneath the footing	91
Table 3-7	Element size and number used to investigate the influence of	93
Table 3-8	Statistical properties obtained from Monte Carlo simulation to measure effectiveness of site investigation scope	98
Table 3-9	Code profiling results	101
Table 3-10	Benchmark results for various FORTRAN 77 and FORTRAN 90 compilers After Polyhedron Software (2004)	101
Table 3-11	Cross platform computational times for 1000 Monte Carlo realisations for a soil COV of 50% and SOF of 8 m	103
Table 3-12	Comparison of program run times for varying number of processors using Message Passing Interface (MPI)	105

Chapter 4 Verification of Methodology

Table 4-1	Goodness of fit statistics for simulated soil with a lognormal distribution	110
Table 4-2	Comparison between target and sample mean and standard deviation of simulated soils	112
Table 4-3	Verification of settlement estimates for single pad footing	126
Table 4-4	Settlement estimates for corner and central edge footings of the 9-pad system	127
Table 4-5	Measured settlements obtained from various literature sources including analysis parameters	129

Chapter 5 Effect of Different Settlement Prediction Techniques on the Design and Analysis of a Pad Foundation

Table 5-1	Comparison of settlement prediction technique coefficients based on a 1.5 m × 1.5 m footing for a soil with a uniform elastic modulus	148
Table 5-2	Results of the Chi-square goodness-of-fit test for settlement estimates with a lognormal distribution (<i>p</i> value shown in parenthesis)	155
Table 5-3	Probability that prediction technique settlement is less than 3DFEA settlement	163

Chapter 6 Effect of Site Investigations on Design Parameters and the Design of a Pad Foundation

Table 6-1	Adopted uncertainties due to measurement and transformation model error for each test type investigated	228
-----------	---	-----

Chapter 7 Reliability Assessment of a Site Investigation in Terms of Foundation Design

Table 7-1	Range of uncertainties used in sensitivity analysis of test measurement error	292
-----------	---	-----

Chapter 8 Risk Assessment of Site Investigations in Terms of Foundation Design

Table 8-1	Costs associated with different site investigation tests Adapted from Jaksa (2004)	300
Table 8-2	Building construction and substructure costs by number of storeys	301
Table 8-3	Description of failure severities and rehabilitation works	305
Table 8-4	Severity of cracking damage After Day (1999)	307
Table 8-5	Adopted settlement and differential settlement limits for failure severity or rehabilitation work category	307
Table 8-6	Pad footing loads for the three building sizes investigated	332
Table 8-7	Range of rehabilitation limits trailed in sensitivity analysis Differential settlements in parenthesis (m/m)	341
Table 8-8	Effect of site conditions and site investigation variables on costs	348

Chapter 9 Analysis Using Specific Soil Data

Table 9-1	Summary of results from the South Parklands site Adapted from Jaksa (1995)	355
Table 9-2	Average statistical values of the cone tip resistance for each layer and overall depth at the Texas A&M University “Sand Site” Adapted from Akkaya and Vanmarcke (2003)	360
Table 9-3	Statistical properties of the varved clay site in New Liskeard, Canada	364

Chapter 10 Summary and Recommendations

Table 10-1	Effect of site conditions and site investigation variables on costs	378
------------	---	-----

NOTATION

1Q	1 st quartile selection
2:1	2:1 settlement prediction technique
3DFEA	Three dimensional finite element analysis
A	Area – subscripts used to denote object (e.g. footing, influence area)
A_{opt}	Optimal footing area designed using complete knowledge
B	Shape factor for settlement estimate
a	Shape factor for settlement estimate
b	Width or least plan dimension of the footing
b_{infrac}	Width of the influence region
b'	Effective width or least plan dimension of the footing
C^*	Variable representing correction factors, load and footing size
C^{**}	Variable representing strain influence factor and C^*
C_1	Footing embedment correction factor (Schmertmann)
C_2	Time correction factor (Schmertmann)
CK	Complete knowledge of the soil (all properties known)
COV	Coefficient of variation
Cov[.]	Covariance operator
CPT	Cone penetration test
c	Cohesion
c_w	Width of column
D	Depth of the compressible soil layer
D_A	Test parameter A from DMT
D_B	Test parameter B from DMT
DE	Design error
d_e	Footing embedment depth
DFT	Discrete Fourier transformation method

DMT	Marchetti flat plate dilatometer test
D_r	Relative density
D_v	Averaging domain
d	Thickness of footing for beam shear
d_{om}	Depth to top of reinforcing
d_t	Total thickness of footing
E	Elastic modulus
$E[.]$	Expectation operator
E_{ave}	Averaged elastic modulus value
E_{COV}	Coefficient of variation of elastic modulus field
E_D	Elastic modulus from DMT
E_f	Elastic modulus value taken directly from random field
E_{PMT}	Elastic modulus from PMT
E_r	Resultant elastic modulus value after effects of system uncertainty
E_{SOF}	Scale of Fluctuation of elastic modulus field (isotropic)
e_i	Proportion of element size in relation to total
F	Random variable representing load
FFT	Fast Fourier transformation
FORM	First order reliability method
FOS	Factor of safety
FOSM	First order second moment reliability method
f'_c	Yield strength of concrete
f_{cv}	Shear capacity of concrete
f_i	Proportion of number of samples in relation to number of elements
f_s	Sleeve friction from CPT
G	Shear strain modulus
GA	Geometric average
H	Depth of stress change
HA	Harmonic average
H_b	Height of structure of building
h	Difference between corner and middle settlements of a flexible footing
$I_1; I_2; I_F$	Shape factors
I_2	Inverse distance squared weighted
ID	Inversed distance weighted
I_p	Influence factor

I_{p_x}, I_{p_y}	Size of the site investigation in x- and y-directions
I_z	Strain influence factor
Jan	Janbu settlement prediction technique
K_D	From DMT
k	Bulk modulus
k_s	Modulus of subgrade reaction
L	Shape factor for settlement estimate
LAS	Local average subdivision
LI	Liquid index
l	Length or largest plan dimension of the footing
M	Shape factor for settlement estimate
MA	Moving average method
MN	Minimum value selection
MOS	Margin of safety
MPI	Message passing interface (parallel processing)
m	Random variable representing measurement error
m_b	Random variable representing bias component of measurement error
m_F	Mean of random variable representing load
m_R	Mean of random variable representing capacity
m_r	Random variable representing random component of measurement error
N	SPT blow count
N_γ	Bearing capacity factor
N_θ	Shape factor for settlement estimate
N_c	Bearing capacity factor
New	Newmark settlement prediction technique
N_q	Bearing capacity factor
n	Number of samples to reduce
n_f	Number of footings in foundation system
n_l	Number of discretised layers
n_r	Number of realisations
n_t	Total population size
OCR	Over-consolidation ratio
P	Applied footing load
Per	Perloff settlement prediction technique

PI	Plastic index
PMT	Pressuremeter test
p_f	Probability of failure
p_L	Pressuremeter limit stress
p_{od}	Probability of over design
p_{op}	Probability of attaining an optimal design
p_{ud}	Probability of under design
Q_{su}	Side resistance
Q_{tu}	Tip resistance
Q_u	Available capacity
Q_{ud}	Design uplift capacity
q	Applied footing pressure
q_a	Allowable bearing capacity
$q_{a_{net}}$	Net allowable bearing capacity
q_{av}	Averaging pressure over the footing contact area
q_c	Cone tip resistance from CPT
q_u	Unconfined compression strength
q_{ult}	Ultimate bearing capacity
q_z	Stress at depth z
q_z	Stress in soil at depth z
Δq	Change in stress
R	Random variability representing capacity
RFEM	Random finite element method
RG	Regular grid sampling pattern
RN	Simple random arrangement of sample locations
r_i	Internal radius of annulus
r_o	External radius of annulus
S	Estimated footing settlement
SA	Standard arithmetic average
Sch2B	Schmertmann settlement prediction technique based on 2B-0.6 strain distribution
SchM	Schmertmann settlement prediction technique based on Modified strain distribution
SE	Settlement error
SFEM	Stochastic finite element method
SGS	Sequential Gaussian simulation

SI	Site investigation knowledge of the soil (based on sampling)
SI_{opt}	Optimal site investigation cost, based on yielding the lowest total cost
SI_{opt}^*	Optimal site investigation cost for the worst case SOF
SIS	Sequential indicator simulation
SOF	Scale of fluctuation (measure of correlation distance)
SOSM	Second-order second-moment reliability method
SPT	Standard penetration test
SR	Stratified random sampling pattern
$St_x; St_y$	Size of the site in x- and y-directions
s_γ	Bearing capacity correction factor for unit weight
s_c	Bearing capacity correction factor for cohesion
s_i	Distance separating the i th sample location and the footing
s_F	Standard deviation of random variable representing load
s_R	Standard deviation of random variable representing capacity
s_{tot}	Total distance separating all sample locations and the footing
s_u	Undrained shear strength
sv	Random variable representing uncertainty due to spatial variability
T	Transformation model
T&G	Timoshenko and Goodier settlement prediction technique
TBM	Turning bands method
TBM	Turning bands method
TT	Triaxial test
$t(z)$	Trend value at depth z
tm	random variable representing transformation model error
V	Shape factor for settlement estimate
V^*	Applied shear load on footing
V_1	Shape factor for settlement estimate
$V_1^*; V_2^*$	Components of the applied shear load, V^*
VST	Vane shear test
Var[.]	Variance operator
V_{u0}	Punching shear capacity
V_{uc}	Beam shear capacity
W	Weight of shaft
W_b	Width of structure or building
Wst	Westergaard settlement prediction technique

$w(z)$	Fluctuating residual value at depth z
w_L	Water content at liquid limit
w_n	Natural water content
w_p	Water content at plastic limit
X	Random variable
X_{\ln}	Lognormal random variable
x	Individual property that conforms to X
x_c	X coordinate
x_d	Distance to parabolic centroid
Y	Random variable
y_c	Y coordinate
Z	Centre-to-centre spacing of two adjacent footings
z	Depth in soil layer
Δz	Soil layer thickness
α	Shape factor for settlement estimate
β	Reliability index
β_1	Shape factor for beam shear capacity
β_τ	Covariance at lag τ
δ	Footing settlement
$\delta_{1 2}$	Settlement of Footing 1 due to Footing 2
δ_{ann}	Settlement of rigid annulus
δ_c	Corner settlement of flexible footing
δ_m	Centre settlement of flexible footing
δ_r	Rigid footing settlement
ε	Strain
γ	Unit weight of soil
γ'	Effective unit weight of soil
γ_d	Dry unit weight of soil
$\chi(D)$	Variance reduction based on an averaging domain of D
γ_h	Semivariogram value at distance h
η_0	Footing embedment correction factor
η_1	Layer depth correction factor
η_a, η_b	Fitted constants for the Janbu settlement relationship
κ	Deterministic coefficient representing settlement prediction technique coefficients and design criteria limits

λ	Differential settlement ratio $ \delta_1 - \delta_2 /Z$
$\mu_{\ln x}$	Sample mean of the logarithm of x
μ_x	Sample mean of x
ν	Poisson's ratio
θ	Isotropic scale of fluctuation, SOF
θ_h	Vertical scale of fluctuation, SOF
θ_v	Vertical scale of fluctuation, SOF
θ_{wc}	Worst case scale of fluctuation, SOF
ρ_{min}	Percentage of steel reinforcing
ρ_τ	Correlation at lag τ
σ_e^2	Variance due to equipment effects
$\sigma_{\ln x}$	Sample standard deviation of the logarithm of x
$\sigma_{\ln x}^2$	Sample variance of the logarithm of x
σ_m^2	Variance due to measurement error
σ_n'	Overburden pressure
$\sigma_{p/o}^2$	Variance due to procedural and operator effects
σ_{sv}^2	Variance due to spatial variability
σ_T^2	Variance due to all forms of uncertainty
σ_{tm}^2	Variance due to transformation model error
σ_r^2	Variance due to random test effects
σ_x	Sample standard deviation of x
σ_x^2	Sample variance of x
ϕ	Angle of internal friction
ϕ_{red}	Concrete strength reduction factor
τ	Lag or separation distance vector = $\{\tau_x, \tau_y, \tau_z\}$
τ_x	Lag or separation distance in the x-direction
τ_y	Lag or separation distance in the y-direction
τ_z	Lag or separation distance in the z-direction
ω	Angle representing the rate of stress decrease
ψ°	Angle in degrees used to proportion footing area in relation to annulus
ψ^f	Angle in radians used to proportion footing area in relation to annulus
ξ_d	Design parameter
ξ_m	Measured soil property
$\xi(z)$	In situ soil property at depth z